

# LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK: 01112335

(PLEASE PRINT ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

LICENSEE NAME: PIA/PIB LICENSE NUMBER: 00-000000-00 EVENT TYPE: 4 REPORT DATE: 01/17/75

CONT: 111 REPORT TYPE: 1 REPORT OFFICE: 1 OCCUR NUMBER: 0150-000000 EVENT ON: 01/17/75 REPORT DATE: 01/22/75

EVENT DESCRIPTION (RD-75-21)  
A BLOCKING WORK PERMIT THAT APPLIED TO TWO CRITICAL RESET VALUES FOR THE 'B' REGENERATION PUMP DIFFERENTIAL PRESSURE SWITCHES FOR A VALVE REPAIR WAS NOT CANCELED PRIOR TO RESUME OPERATION. THIS INVOLVED LPCS LOOP SELECTION LOGIC, HOWEVER LOOP SELECTION WOULD STILL HAVE BEEN PROPERLY MADE. PROCEDURAL CHANGES WERE MADE TO PREVENT RECURRENCE, ALSO THE LICENSEE VIEWING HIS INSTRUMENTS WERE

SYSTEM CODE: SE CAUSE CODE: D COMPONENT CODE: INSTRU FROM COMPONENT SUPPLY: 43 COMPONENT MANUFACTURE: 44 VIOLATION: 45

CAUSE DESCRIPTION  
AN INDIVIDUAL FAILED TO IDENTIFY THAT THE BLOCK WAS ON A SAFETY RELATED SYSTEM DURING COMPLETION OF THE STARTUP CHECK-OFF-LIST. THE MAINTENANCE REQUEST FORM WILL BE USED TO IDENTIFY SAFETY RELATED ITEMS IN WRITING IN THE FUTURE.

FACILITY STATUS: 1 POWER: 1100 OTHER STATUS: NA METHOD OF DISCOVERY: 1A DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION: WORK REVIEW  
FORM OF ACTIVITY RELEASED: 2 CONTENT OF RELEASE: 1A AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY: NA LOCATION OF RELEASE: NA

PERSONNEL EXPOSURES  
NUMBER: 000 TYPE: 2 DESCRIPTION: NA

PERSONNEL INJURIES  
NUMBER: 000 DESCRIPTION: NA

OFFSITE CONSEQUENCES  
NA

LOSS OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY  
TYPE: 2 DESCRIPTION: NA

PUBLICITY  
NA

ADDITIONAL FACTORS  
NA

# PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

2301 MARKET STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19101

19101-14000

12335

March 27, 1975

Mr. A. Giambusso  
Director  
Division of Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Giambusso:

Subject: Abnormal Occurrence

The following occurrence was reported to Mr. Walt Baunack, Region I Office of Inspection and Enforcement, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission on March 17, 1975. Written notification was made to Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, Region I, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission on March 17, 1975. In accordance with Section 6.7.2.A of the Technical Specifications, Appendix A of DPR-44 for Unit 2 Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, the following report is being submitted to the Directorate of Reactor Licensing as an Abnormal Occurrence.

Reference: License Number DPR-44  
Technical Specification Reference: Table 3.2.B

Report No.: 50-277-75-21  
Report Date: March 27, 1975  
Occurrence Date: March 17, 1975  
Facility: Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station  
R.D. 1, Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Identification of Occurrence:

Improper valving which resulted in defeating the "B" Recirc pump differential pressure switches.

Conditions Prior to Occurrence:

Unit 2 at full power.

Description of Occurrence:

It was discovered that a blocking work permit applied to the common root valves for the "B" Recirc pump differential pressure switches

3448

112333  
for the repair of a valve block had not been cleared prior to reactor operation. These switches supply information to the LPCI loop selection logic as to which pumps are running.

Designation of Apparent Cause of Occurrence:

Individual failure to identify that the block was on a safety related system during completion of the startup check-off-list.

Analysis of Occurrence:

Analysis of the possible Recirc. pump running combinations and Recirc. pump break locations for a LOCA condition indicates that if the LPCI were needed, loop selection would have been properly made. The health and safety of the public was not affected by this valving error.

Corrective Action:

The improper valving was immediately corrected by clearing the blocking work permit on the affected valving. Because individual error in the blocking permit review process prior to plant startup was responsible for the problem, a mechanism has been developed to improve the quality of the information presented to the reviewer in order to preclude a recurrence.

In the past, the individual who reviews Maintenance Request Forms and blocking permits relied on his own memory as a senior license operator to determine if a specific device relates to the technical specifications.

By means of a letter from the Plant Superintendent to the appropriate personnel, the burden of identifying technical specification related items is being transferred from the reviewer to the individual who authorizes the work to be done. The individual who authorizes the work will identify technical specification related items, in writing, on the Maintenance Request Form. This information will then be carried through the blocking permit system.


When the MRF and blocking permit review is being done prior to a plant startup, the identification of the device as a technical specification item will be plain and pronounced further enhancing the quality of the review.

This mechanism which has been implemented shall be included in the plant's administrative procedures.

Failure Data:

None previous.

Very truly yours,

  
H. J. Cooney  
Asst Gen'l Superintendent  
Generation Division